

The COMMUNIST

"All Power to the Workers!"

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

Vol. II., No. 5.

MAY 8, 1920

PRICE 5 CENTS

Who Are The Terrorists?

TERRORISM is the first expedient of despotism. It has no doubt shocked many Americans who do not realize the inevitable bitterness of the class struggle, just now coming into its sharper stages in the United States, how readily our sons of the "sweet land of liberty" could perform the role made familiar by the officials of czarism and kaiser rule. The gentle, scholarly, pious Mr. Wilson quickly adjusted himself to the statesmanship and militarism of finance-imperialism, since his mind must follow the inevitable development of capitalism, scorning the only alternative, a new industrial and social system.

Attorney General Palmer, a member of the Quaker group of pacifists, blossoms forth as the most drastic, reckless, unscrupulous prosecutor in any country today. In Hungary or Germany, Palmer would be directing executions by the thousands on the least suspicion of Communist sympathy, just as in America he seeks deportations by the thousands on the flimsiest pretexts of fact and law.

The mentality of this man Palmer is neatly epitomized in his sententious declaration that thousands of agents have come here from Russia to preach dictatorship of the proletariat "in a land where there is no proletariat".

Palmer evidently expected to become president of the United States by the good fortune of having the front of his home shot away by a bomb. Those who followed the story of that bombing are still wondering about its curious details. Of course we do not say that Palmer tried the advertising stunt of doing it himself. Such things happened under similar police methods. But there is no proof that Palmer threw his own bomb. Nor is there the least proof that anybody else did. That is where the matter rests — except that Palmer builds campaign speeches around his lucky bomb.

For the observance of May Day, this year, Palmer announced a whole string of bombs. Whatever he did

with them has not yet appeared in the newspapers. That anybody else was in this bombing party as principal or accessory has not been announced. It was Mr. Palmer's own little affair, and fortunately for the intended victims the May Day celebration as it actually occurred did not include Mr. Palmer's special stunt.

But our Quaker terrorist is after all quite a "piker" alongside of Leonard Wood. A few hundred deportations, a few thousand jailings, a careless bombing or two, this record pales before the warrior presence of the stolid soldier-politician whom Wall Street is staking for the presidency.

We have had ample opportunity to observe that everytime anybody utters solemnities about "law and order" that something strenuous has been done or is about to be done to take a whack at the labor movement. Say the Wood supporters: "The uncertainty of the hour makes one leading issue for this campaign and that issue is Law and Order." Then is quoted a resolution passed by the American Bar Association:

"Now be it therefore resolved that the liberties of the people and the preservation of their institutions depend upon the control and exercise by the Federal, State and municipal governments of whatever force is necessary to maintain at all hazards the supremacy of the law and to suppress disorder and punish crime."

Then the query: "What candidate is as competent and experienced to carry out this resolution as General Leonard Wood?" Not much is left for the imagination. The mighty warrior of Gary distinction, the warrior who made a grand stand play about quitting his campaign to array "law and order" against the railroad strikers, this is the ideal candidate of American imperialism today. Never mind the "issues" which may go into the fake platforms, never mind the complexities of international affairs, just pay attention to "disorder" and "crime" at home and elect a president accordingly. In other words, we have

come to the time when all "issues" are reduced to one real issue, the fight for capitalistic privilege, euphemistically described as the people's liberties and institutions, against the working class assertion, labeled "crime" and "disorder".

If we have a Wood for president and a Palmer for Attorney General, and a like-minded official family generally, as is more than likely, it may become somewhat clearer to a few millions in this country that the government is a police institution in behalf of the system of capitalist-imperialism. Things will happen, as they have already been happening in connection with every labor assertion of serious proportions, which will sharply emphasize the true character of our "democratic" government. Congress will only be discussed in the comic papers. "Law and order" will rage throughout the land — and then what? Well, one can begin to imagine the heavy tramp of the marching millions, as the light bursts through which transforms the beast of burden into the human being who demands the right to live as master of his own destiny, himself and his co-workers together.

Terrorism and unlimited force, this is the program against the working class assertion. Today "law and order" threatens even the right to strike, as in Kansas. There have been several important anti-strike judicial decisions; anti-strike proposals keep coming up before Congress, and the wierd extensions of the use of injunctions continue.

And there will still be the high privilege offered "the people" of voting for the supreme police officers, so that the unlimited force can be applied in behalf of "their" liberties and "their" institutions.

The Communists scorn either the fear or the use of terrorism. They appeal for working class education and organization, for class consciousness and its effective organization expression in industry, for the mass array and action against capitalism and all the institutions which defend it.

"We cannot change the weather nor abate the storm by deporting the barometer".

The Communist



OFFICIAL ORGAN
COMMUNIST PARTY
OF AMERICA

David Damon,
Acting Editor.

VOL. II.

No. 5.

May 8, 1920.

Singles copies — 5c

Communist Party Criticism.

BEGINNING with Karl Marx, the most unsparing critics of the socialist movement have been the Socialists and Communists themselves. The literature of the movement is primarily a critical study of the social process, and this criticism is directed equally to the socialist movement as part of the general social process. It is, indeed, the pride of socialist science that it is no less critical of itself than it is of the bourgeois systems of thought and action.

In the United States, however, there has been largely an acceptance of socialist science as a system of dogma and absolute faith, rather than as a method of analysis. What is required to vitalize socialist science is its constant adaptation to changing circumstances, but the Socialists of this country, for the most part, have considered it sufficient to take over formulas of words without seriously considering the implication of these words in action. The Socialist Party, with 'preambles' concerning the class struggle and the social revolution, proceeded strictly along the lines of bourgeois politics, appealing to the workers to use bourgeois policies as their primary method of action.

The Socialist Labor Party some years ago degenerated into a static, servile observance of phrase-formulas, serving to give the least consideration to the constant progression of the class struggle. Recently the I. W. W., in its official literature, has shown stubbornness in insisting upon senseless dogmas, even to the point of savagely attacking the whole Communist movement rather than to give up two or three empty phrases. But the I. W. W., in contrast with the Socialist Labor Party, has a vitality which is belied by its own official propaganda, the vitality of a militant embodiment of industrial unionism.

On the other hand, it is certainly true that the Communist Party is not free from the same vice. The Communist phrases have the advantage, however, of greater inherent vitality, because they are the phrases of the

proletarian revolution in action. Bolshevism, as developed by the Russian and other Marxians during the past two decades, was a synthetic application of the science of Marx to the concrete facts of capitalism at the stage of finance-imperialism. The Communist International expresses not a revision or a variant of Marxism but a faithful adaptation of the underlying concepts of socialist science to the actual social facts of today.

But it is not enough for the American Communist Party to take over ready-made the principles and slogans of the Communist International. There must continue to be an adaptation of these precepts of working class action to the further developments of capitalism. There must be more or less adaptation of these principles of action to the special circumstances of the class struggle as it develops in this country.

It may be said, in all candor, that up to this time our zeal has been more in the direction of faithful imitation of phrases than in Communist expression of the class struggle as it develops from day to day in the United States. We have done only a little toward the integration of Communist understanding with the great working class battles of the past year, but even that little marks off the Communist Party decisively as the most aggressive working class organization in the United States and the most responsive to the mass movements which are the life force of the revolution.

Our crying need is a more precise and more understandable expression of Communism as part of the everyday working class fight in the United States. The vaguest sort of phrases will serve the purposes of celebrating the Russian revolution, which has been too much the exclusive concern of our public meetings. But only the most precise phrases of immediate application will challenge the attention of the millions of workers.

The weakness of the Communist Party is on the side of its immediate program. This is not so much the fault of the September Convention as it is of the Central Executive Committee, which ignored or dodged practically all problems of immediate action, even the primary problem of education of our membership.

Let no one dismiss the present struggle in the party as an affair of a few persons who happen to be the party officials. It is a life and death struggle to save the party from the grasp of the Russian nationalists who have made a demagogic merger of nationalistic and ultra-revolutionary phrases, but to whom the building of a real party to take part in the class conflict in the United States is meaningless.

Against this group are arrayed most of the members of the party, without distinction of nationality. Practically all of the Federation members have made known their hostility to the use of their Federat-

ions as counter-organizations to the party, as has been too long the case. They want Communist propaganda in their own language; they are done with nationalistic demagogism in the interest of Russian-speaking politicians.

There will be no harm to the Communist movement in this country on account of the repudiation of the Central Executive Committee by the active party organizers, if the members survey critically the history of the Left Wing movement since last June and take its lessons to heart.

Our Deportation Cases.

ACTUAL deportation of Communists has already begun. There will be no more "arks", but small groups will be taken on freight or passenger ships right along. A number of deportees from the middle West were gathered at Chicago to start their journey to Europe on May first, among them John Schedel of Fort Wayne, Indiana, who leaves behind him a sick wife and five small children, all born in the United States. Schedel has been in this country since 1906, has always been a steady, industrious worker. But he became a Socialist, then a Communist, so he outlived his welcome to this free country. We have as yet no information as to Schedel's fellow-voyagers.

The first attempt to defeat the Communist deportation warrants by court action was begun in Boston, before District Judge Anderson, some weeks ago. This case has brought to light the lawlessness of the raids as conducted by the Attorney General's staff, also the brutal treatment accorded the thousands arrested, most of them upon the vaguest sort of suspicion. Already the Department of Labor has cancelled more than half of the 3000 warrants of arrest issued at the beginning of the year, and there is every likelihood that many ordered deported will be released by the courts. The record of the Boston cases will no doubt be published in detail as soon as available.

Writs for the release of four deportees have also been filed in Milwaukee, to come up soon before District Judge Geiger.

Meanwhile a vicious attack is being made against Assistant Secretary of Labor Louis F. Post, who is disposing of these cases for the Department of Labor. To be suspected of being a Bolshevik is quite enough in the minds of some of our Congressmen, and it is claimed that Post is derelict in his duty for examining these cases from the angle of legal evidence.

It may now be definitely said that there will be only a few hundred orders of deportation out of the 3000 January arrests. It remains to be seen whether or not these orders will withstand judicial scrutiny, though it is already certain that quite a number of the cases will not be brought into court, because the deportees are not interested in further contest.

What Kind of Party?

An Answer to the Majority Group of the C. E. C.

THE present crisis in the Communist Party organization presents the opportunity through membership action to make the party really a party of understanding and a party of action.

During the seven months that the party has been in existence the work of developing its organization strength and carrying its message to the masses has been hampered by a group in the Central Executive Committee which was more interested in the personal "revolutionary fortunes" of its members than in building up the party.

This group has shown itself to be incompetent to develop constructive organization work and as a matter of policy has sought to keep the party organization within very narrow limits. This latter policy was not based upon any question of principle, but upon the realization by this group — the majority group of the C. E. C. — that it could maintain its position of leadership in the organization only so long as the movement was prevented from attracting to its ranks men of greater capability.

The policy of the majority group toward the Communist Labor Party, both during the Chicago conventions and since, was not determined by the widely heralded difference in principles. The "majority" group has been frequently challenged to show these differences by analysis of the programs of the two parties, but never has done so. The aim was to prevent this group from being ousted from its position of prominence and leadership in the Communist Party — a position which it could not hold in an organization which included all the Communist elements, because it has neither the capability of applying Communist principles in action nor the organization ability to entitle it to such leadership.

This use of power in order to safeguard its position has not only been made against the C. L. P. but has been used in the party itself, notably in New York City, where comrades of considerable ability, whose services would have been of great advantage to the party, have been shunted aside because they were not enthusiastic enough in their support of this factional group.

Whenever this majority group of the Central Executive Committee was under attack because of its factional policy it has taken refuge in loudly shouting about "differences in principle". It realizes that the members of the Communist Party are really in earnest in their desire to maintain the party as a clear expression of Communist fundamentals, and that by assuming the part of "defenders of principles" it could always shout down those who attacked it because of its intrigues.

Now that its use of power for selfish ends has brought about a split in the Central Executive Committee, it is again raising the issue of "differences in principles" as a smoke cloud behind which to hide the fact that it was the intrigues and use of power to maintain its group leadership, even to the extent of disrupting the organization, that has brought about the present situation.

Analysis of these "differences in principles" is all that is necessary to show the hypocrisy and demagogic character of this "majority" group.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

Through some twisting of the facts the attempt is made in the manifesto of the "majority" group to create out of the controversy over European representation one of the "issues of principle". The fact is that no such issue exists.

The controversy over this question developed on the point whether matters of party policy should be decided by the governing body of the party or by underhanded intrigue of a group within the Central Executive Committee. It was this underhanded intrigue of individuals, who, immediately after the adjournment of the Chicago convention, took no further interest in the upbuilding of the Communist Party of America, but devoted practically all their time to the intrigue to become the party representative in Europe, which created this controversy.

The "minority" did not at anytime oppose the establishment of relations with the Third International. Steps were taken by the Executive Secretary, before the question of sending a representative developed, to acquaint the Third International with the facts about the organization and principles of the Communist Party, and only a few weeks ago the comrade who took this information to Europe returned with the report that it had been successfully transmitted to Moscow.

The controversy over sending the International Secretary to Europe was not over the question whether we should be represented in the Third International. It was because underhanded methods were resorted to; and the argument was only over the question of time and party resources.

The matter was first broached three weeks after the party convention. At that time the party was in the midst of organization work and a bitter controversy with the C. L. P. It did not have five speakers who could present its cause in English, and the same was true in regard to writers and editors. Yet it was proposed to immediately take out of the party work the man who had up to that time held the position of leadership in the editorial work of the movement. When the question finally came to a decision in November, there

was not a single vote against sending the International Secretary to Europe. It has since developed that the trip could have been delayed another two months and had exactly the same results for the movement. Yet it is sought to magnify this question into an issue of "principle". This is itself the best example of the kind of bluff the "majority" group uses in order to deceive the party membership.

The facts about the matter of relations with the Third International are that the "minority" group has fought for a policy in harmony with the ideas expressed by the Third International, while the "majority" has disagreed and has taken the attitude of "super-Bolsheviks" who look with contempt upon the policies of the Third International. This is illustrated in the "majority" group issue of the "Communist". In an editorial on "The Party Crisis" this statement appears:

"The 'secessionists' believe that subscribing to the three fundamental and basic policies of the Third International, namely — Proletarian Dictatorship, Mass Action and Soviet Power, is sufficient in itself upon which to build a Communist movement in this country".

The inference in this statement is that the "majority" group do not believe this to be the case and the policy it has pursued is further proof. And from whom did this statement of policy with which the "minority" group is charged with agreeing, come? From the Third International!

There have been three of four communications on the subject of unity of Communist elements from the Third International. Two of these at least were directly concerned with the question of unity of Communist forces in the United States. One such communication was brought by a representative of the Third International sent to this country to organize a Communist Party before the time of the convention. Another was published in the New York World, having been taken from a courier who was captured and shot in Lettvia. And each of these documents urged the unity of all those elements in a Communist Party which accepted the three fundamentals, Mass Action as the means of achieving power, the Dictatorship of the proletariat, Soviet government.

Yes, comrades of the "majority", the "minority" group accepts this basis of Communist unity and is working to build a real Communist organization of action on this basis, while you reject the position of the Third International, fearing the loss of personal prestige and power, and attempt to create some superfine

"difference in principles", which, however, you are unable to define, in order to bluff the membership of the party into helping you maintain your clique control. You dare say in your manifesto:

"If there is one outstanding difference between the Second and Third International — aside from the vital differences in tactics — it is, that the Third Communist International, must be and is a living, vital organism, actually functioning in the world-revolutionary movement, guiding and shaping the policies of the Communist parties of all countries."

"Guiding and shaping the policies of the Communist parties of all countries!" — and yet you repudiate the Third International the moment its policies are contrary to your group interests!

MASS ACTION

The present "majority" group, through its caucus, controlled the Chicago convention. What the program of the party says about mass action is something the "majority" is responsible for. When someone challenged the "majority" to say what was meant by "mass action of the revolution" no one of the "majority" group dared rise to his feet and declare that "mass action of the revolution" meant open, armed conflict between the working class and the capitalist state.

The reason which the "majority" group would give for its failure to state fully the implications of the Communist program at the time was that the Communist Party was being organized as a legal party. If this was a good reason for silence at that time, can we now bind those of our members who have been arrested and indicted for their activities during this period of "legality" not to take the same position? This has been the only way in which the issue has become before the Central Executive Committee. Of course the members of the "majority" were not in a position of danger on this account and they were indifferent to the fate of the many hundreds of comrades throughout the country who are held for deportation and imprisonment.

The party must be ready to put into its program the definite statement that mass action culminates in open insurrection and armed conflict with the capitalist state. The party program and the party literature dealing with our program and policies should clearly express our position on this point. On this question there is no disagreement.

There is a difference in viewpoint between the "minority" and "majority" as to when the idea of armed revolt need be and should be projected to the masses. The "minority" holds that if it were to inject this question into such a struggle as the strike of the railwaymen it would be acting as the agent provocateur of the capitalist class.

The position of the Third International was stated as follows in the

official copy of the manifesto and program:

"The revolutionary epoch demands the application of such methods of struggle which concentrate the entire strength of the proletariat; namely the method of mass actions and — their logical outcome — direct collision with the bourgeois state in open combat".

This declaration conceives of mass action in different forms, for the phrase is mass actions. It is the view of the "minority" in harmony with this declaration, that mass action develops by stages of which open, armed conflict is stated to be the final stage; that the Communist Party must suit its propaganda at any given moment to the stage of mass action which can be developed through the existing revolutionary consciousness which the social and industrial conditions have produced.

The "majority" seems to be of the opinion that there is only one kind of mass action, that of armed conflict, for it says,

"With this conception of mass action the "majority" completely disagrees. We maintain, that if the lessons of the history of all revolutions — and particularly — the proletarian revolutions — mean something and teaches us anything (lessons which the Second International completely failed to learn) — we must propagate to the workers the USE OF FORCE as the ONLY MEANS of conquering the power of the state and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat".

Since it conceives of only one form of mass action, the "majority" takes the position that the propaganda of the party must in every instance be that of armed conflict. This is the anarchist position and a perversion of the principles of the Third International.

The members of the "majority" are dogmatists. Even their view of the present situation in our party had to be expressed in language of the Russian Revolution — Kornilov and Kerensky — in order to appeal to their dogmatic minds. If they accept a certain principle they consider that its application is the same under all conditions. They would reject as outrageous Lenin's advice to Bela Kun that the Hungarian Soviets should not slavishly try to imitate the Russian Revolution. In fact some of them are carrying on a propaganda against Lenin as a compromiser. In their opinion he is in the same class as the "minority". The "minority" holds that we should assume the dialectical view and consider each situation by itself. The circumstances under which a certain principle is applied is all-important in determining the course of action to pursue.

In carrying on the work of agitation and education, the social and industrial conditions must be considered. To talk to the workers about armed insurrection at a time when

the masses are still without any revolutionary consciousness (and without arms) is to make a farce of Communism and shows a fundamental lack of understanding of Communist principles.

Mass action is the tactical essence of the entire program adopted at Chicago. It has been the dominant theme of all our party literature. Just why does the "majority" now suddenly come to the realization that all our propaganda and program have been non-Communist? This is nothing but a shallow, cowardly play of being ultra-revolutionary.

It is the same demagogism as the appeal to the Federation members that there is prejudice against "foreigners". Obviously it must be a disdain of "foreigners" by "foreigners". The "minority" group is about 99% "foreign."

Federations

Since our party is a party largely of Federation membership, the "majority" naturally tries to inject the the Federation issue into the controversy, hoping thereby to secure the support of this membership.

What are the facts?

In the past the party has been a Federation of Federations rather than a unified organization. The Central Executive Committee of a Federation could by majority vote take a Federation out of the party whenever it suited the majority. A notable example of this is the desertion of the party by the Hungarian Federation after the January raids. It left the party without so much as saying "good-by". Similarly the Jewish Federation Central Executive Committee withdrew that Federation from the party when the present controversy developed, hoping to remain neutral.

The "minority" believes that the new conditions require a more centralized organization than we have had in the past, closer unity in the Communist Party than a Federation of Federations. It proposed, for this reason, and because experience had shown that it was a more efficient system, that dues payments should be handled through the District Organizations. This would have brought about a closer unity between the membership. In place of having to deal with nine offices located in different cities, the membership of the Federation branches would all transact their business with one central office with which they were in direct connection.

The "minority" also holds that the future development of the party organization must be in the direction of shop units. It is in the industries that we must establish contact with masses of the workers and there our organization must be rooted. With the possibility of nine Federations being represented in a single industry, shop branches and the present form of dues payment cannot exist together.

(Continued on page 8).

"Brief For The Socialist Assemblymen".

COMMENT on the Socialist defense at Albany has heretofore proceeded on the basis of the oral statements made before the Judiciary Committee by those who represented the Socialist Party as lawyers and witnesses. The lawyers included Morris Hillquit and Seymour Stedman, two of the foremost spokesmen of the Socialist Party since its organization in 1901. Hillquit also appeared as the star expert witness on the subject of Socialism and the program of the American Socialist Party. Algeron Lee was also an expert witness; three of the Assemblymen themselves took the stand; the National Secretary of the Socialist Party also participated in the defense.

But with all this it might be said that the oral statements of any or all of these party spokesmen could not be held as declarations of the official policy of the Socialist Party. It would seem, however, that men like Hillquit, Stedman, Lee, Waldman and Branstetter ought to be good authorities on what their party stands for. But if there is any doubt about their ability to tell clearly as lawyers and witnesses what constitutes the party policy, that doubt can hardly exist when their statements are carefully set down in a printed brief which summarizes the defense as an entirety. The printed brief does not give an individual view or interpretation; it is a composite of the best that the Socialist Party had to offer in exposition of its principles.

During the entire defense at Albany the Socialists took the attitude that the hearing was a farce; that expulsion was a foregone conclusion. It was their deliberate object to use this opportunity to proclaim the tenets of Socialism, regardless of the inutility of the defense for the retention of the five vacated assembly seats.

As a general proposition a party could not be held accountable for an interpretation of its principles by any member or official in a criminal trial or investigation. But when representatives of the party are deliberately selected as expert exponents of the party position, that brings us much nearer to a case of party responsibility for the defense. Lawyers are hired to win cases and it is natural to expect them to stretch every margin of interpretation in favor of their theories of legal conformity. But experts on Socialism must be taken to be concerned only with winning an exact understanding of Socialism.

Another special aspect of this trial is that while most Socialist and Communist defendants and witnesses are without experience in the difficult process of stating principles under questions and cross-examination, this could hardly be said of a veteran lawyer and debater like Morris Hillquit. Moreover, the printed argument is signed by six lawyers, four of whom are Socialist Party members

By Y. F.

and one of whom calls himself a Socialist, though not a party member at present. To say that this summary of the defense is not true to the Socialist Party principles it at once to condemn that party as absolutely irresponsible.

As might be inferred, the foregoing comment is in response to the claim of the present pathetic "Left Wing" of the Socialist Party that the Albany defense is not binding upon the Socialist Party. These "Left Wingers" repudiate this defense, but they do not repudiate the Socialist Party. They repudiate Berger also, but they protest that he represents Bergerism, not Socialism. In other words, whatever is done in the name of the Socialist Party by its duly accredited representatives in the courts, in Congress, in city councils, in the party conventions and by the party executive committee, the Socialist Party is still immaculate.

This "Left Wing" is a miserable joke because it is under the delusion that it can escape the inherent treacheries of the Socialist Party by a proper incantation of revolutionary phrases. Does it not demand affiliation with the Communist International? Why does it matter if this is conditioned upon the Communist International itself first becoming something in the image of the American Socialist Party?

The test of last September is conclusive so far as the membership of the party at that time is concerned. Any Socialist who remained with the decadent party after three-fourths of its members repudiated it as a hopeless instrument of the revolutionary class struggle only deceives himself when he tries to gloss over the whole matter with a few phrases of revolutionary sentimentalism. Behind the breakup of the Socialist Party was the clear demarcation of Left and Right which has gone through the century of history of the Socialist movement. This was no playing with phrases; this was a worldwide repudiation of counter-revolutionary Socialism, of that Socialism which stands ready to defend "democratic institutions" even against the on-sweeping militant proletariat.

These farcical "Left Wingers" cannot understand why their party should be classed by the Communists with the German Social-Democrats. In Berlin the Socialist fight for "democracy" is carried on with machine guns and by assassination; in Albany the fight for "democracy" is made with phrases. That is all the difference, and it is no difference at all because the Socialist phrases used at Albany are pregnant with the promise of future action — and that is why so many eminently safe and sane believers in "democracy" are upholding the rights of the Socialist Assemblymen.

"But why not class us with the German Independents?" these Socialists ask. Because the German Independents have no distinct classification except as they act from day to day. In the midst of civil war there can be only two choices of action, the third alternative being inaction. When the Independents fight for soviet power they are Communists, but when they actively or passively sustain the Ebert-Bauer "democracy" they are opponents of the proletarian revolution.

Every member of the Socialist Party is bound by the defense at Albany unless he takes some step to establish the fact that this is a misrepresentation of his party. If the "Left Wingers" of the Socialist Party could conceivably prove themselves as at least good Centrists by disposing of every official responsible for this defense; if they could establish the precise difference between Bergerism and Socialism and eliminate the former from the party (this difference being very much of a mystery to us); if they could finally get the party to act in the way that might suit them, what sort of party would it be? Truth of the matter is these "Left Wingers" differ from Berger only in the degree of miserable hypocrisy, in which respect they are by far the worst sinners, because they attempt to cover up their essential reactionism in an obscurity which only emphasizes their cowardliness and their scabbing on the revolutionary movement.

* * *

A few extracts from the Albany brief will serve to keep fresh in our memories the Socialist confession of faith:

"There is no reason in law or morals why the Socialist Party should not admit aliens to membership. It is not the first political party in America to realize that immigrants are potential voters."

And then, to make sure that nobody will suspect that the interest in the alien goes beyond the vote to his common action as a worker with other workers, it is emphasized that the party constitution has recently been amended by referendum to require immediate naturalization of all its members. So that the Socialist conception of "political action" by the workers is even narrower than ever before in the party history.

"The idea of a general strike for political purposes is one that the Socialist Party of the United States has consistently rejected. The argument has been that if the number of workers in a parliamentary country who are determined to the point of striking for political reform is strong enough to entertain the notion of a general strike, it is strong enough to cast its vote for the reform and effectuate it by political means.

Therefore, the general strike is unnecessary."

Then follows an apology for the flourish about a general strike in opposition to the war which appears in the St. Louis platform, the one exception to the rule. But Mr. Hillquit is quoted as favoring, hypothetically of course, a general strike, if necessary, to sustain "Constitutional rights."

Vote instead of striking, even if three-fourths of the workers have no vote, and even if the vote could not affect the desired political change under American "democracy" without complexities which could not be solved for several generations. Even if a majority were determined to vote the change.

But all this is too silly for serious comment. The general strike is a vital fact of development of working class power. It is not a product of syllogism of logic as conceived by Hillquit, but a product of the pressure of capitalism which forces the proletariat to seek more militant forms of action. The Communists realize that the class struggle must follow the lines of action which working class experience develops, and that among these the general strike is of special value and importance, as evidenced all over the world today. Far from "rejecting" the general strike for political purposes, the American Communist Party has conceived its whole program as centered upon this tactical concept.

"The soviet form of government seems to be good for Russia. The parliamentary form of government seems to be good for the United States."

Good for what? The brief cites copious facts about widespread misery among the workers in this country, facts about the extreme concentration of American wealth in the hands of a very small percentage of the people. Presumably this is what our form of government is good for. But let us go on with this interesting quotation:

"We sympathize with the Russian workers, the Russian peasant, the Russian Socialist, the Russian Communists, in maintaining their Soviet government — not because it is a soviet government, but because it is a government of their own choosing. Suppose they had adopted a different of government, say one that had sprung from the Constituent Assembly, we should not support it any the less."

Try again. If the Russian moujiks had held a plebiscite and voted in the old czar or a new one, and a majority was for keeping up pogroms and all that went with czarism, that would be just as enthusiastically supported by our "democratic" Socialists. It would be the sacred will of the people! Never mind what chicaneries are involved in recording the will of the people. Once the ballot box has spoken, that must be the law of social life.

Somehow or other "the will of the

people" occasionally chooses its own unconstitutional way of manifesting itself, in spite of the ways carefully chosen for its safe and sane manifestation, and this is revolution. But the Socialists insist that revolution is a peculiar way of talking about nationalization of industries. The Communists mean by revolution an actual contest for social control between the rulers who maintain capitalism and the workers upon whom devolves the historic mission of inaugurating the new social order of Communism. In this contest the capitalists insist that only their methods of action shall prevail, but the workers insist upon using the forms of action developed out of their special experience as mass-workers.

The Socialists at Albany were consistent. They expressed unmitigated enthusiasm for the American form of government, declaring that it would be the basis for introducing the Co-operative Commonwealth. The

Communists declare American "democracy" an absolute fraud. They say that it is adapted by its nature only for the perpetuation of exploitation. Only a new form of government, based directly upon the participation of the workers as workers — and barring all others — will give us real democracy.

The Communists are for the soviet government because it is a workers' government in form and because it is Communist in its purposes. They would be against any government anywhere, Constituent Assembly or no Constituent Assembly, voting or no voting, if that government served to perpetuate the capitalist system.

The "Brief for the Socialist Assemblers" — with its express opposition to soviet government and proletarian class rule in the United States — should have been attached to the Socialist Party application for membership in the Communist International.

Hate Has Its Virtues.

HATE has its virtues no less than love. It is only a question of direction, be it love or hate. There are many things and persons to be hated. There is nothing wicked about hatred; there is nothing more sacred about love. It all depends upon the goal, the substance of what is hated or loved.

All of which philosophizing is prompted by the following cover quotation which decorates the March 25th number of Unity:

"Philosophy has no faith in the efficacy of force in making people good. It teaches that people get better and improve, not by the destructive processes of hatred and wrath, but by the constructive method of love and reason. It teaches that goodness comes from within, not from without, that you cannot beat goodness into people, or give them a prescription for it, to be taken in doses, like medicine, but that they must generate it out of their own hearts; and it believes that if we will only make social and economic conditions that will give all men, instead of a few men, a chance to live, they will naturally and inevitably become good. It teaches that you can not make people good by law, nor by policemen's clubs, nor by guns and bayonets, for it sees only hatred in these processes, and it knows, that hatred ceaseth not by hatred; hatred ceaseth but by love.

—Brand Whitlock".

Of course "philosophy" is here used as an alibi for Brand Whitlock. This is what Whitlock teaches and believes. This anti-hatred formula is the favorite anaesthetic handed out by gentlemen like Brand Whitlock against revolution.

For it is to be noted that these gentlemen know quite definitely about the existence of such things as coer-

cive law, policemen's clubs, guns and bayonets. They know that the world is full of organized force to maintain the social and economic system which gives only a few the chance to live. But these gentlemen overlook the truth that everything which sustains this system is organized hate directed against the mass life, a hatred impersonalized and institutionalized.

If a new system is needed so that people may become good, the old anti-social institutions must first be swept aside. These institutions and their conscious defenders must be hated and ruthlessly destroyed. Men and women may be ever so kind and gentle as individuals; they are often quite the opposite as part of an organized system of social coercion. Hatred against them merely as persons is futile. Hatred against them in their capacity of maintaining a social system which hates life — this hatred, organized and directed toward a better social system, is the highest and most beneficent impulse of the human mind.

It is organized force, not love and reason, which maintains the present social system. What is needed is counter-organization, whatever forms of counter-organization can cope in combat with organized force as it now exists, and as it now represses life. The methods of action of this counter-organization cannot be determined by "philosophy", but only by the actuality of the existing organized force.

Communism is the theoretical expression of working class organization and action to destroy capitalism. The dynamic power behind Communism is hatred — hate of tyranny, hate of starvation, mutilation, disease, imprisonments, wars of greed, hate of cynical ostentation. By hate and wrath of the masses will these things be destroyed.

The International Communist Conference.

THE executive Committee is to publish in one volume the reports on the movement in various countries; while the sub-Bureau, after adequate study of the situation in each country, is to issue a comprehensive declaration on prospects, tactics and action. This declaration on prospects, tactics and action will survey the whole international movement, measure the maturity and relation of forces, — interpret revolutionary experience and the prospects of revolution, and indicate the phases of immediate struggle most calculated to promote the revolution.

The Conference and Problems of the International

A vital phase of the theses adopted at the Conference is that they provide the material for an answer to many of the problems now agitating the International. Among these problems are: 1) unionism; 2) the functions of a revolutionary political party; 3) shall Communists stay in the old opportunist organization to "capture" the party, or shall they split; 4) the basis of admission to the Communist International.

1. — The split in the Communist Party of Germany is, fundamentally, the product of antagonistic conceptions of unionism. The Central Committee of the party favors working in the old trades unions — "boring from within," and rejects absolutely the agitation for and construction of industrial unions. The Opposition favors an intense struggle against the trades unions, considering the breaking of their power indispensable for the proletarian revolution, urging the agitation for and construction of industrial unions. (The Opposition, however, rejects the non-political and non-Communist concepts of the I. W. W., conceiving mass action, Soviets and proletarian dictatorship as the means for the conquest of power). On this problem of unionism, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany holds a position of hesitation, evasion and compromise, justifying its "boring from within" policy on the plea that the trades unions include the bulk of the proletarian masses, and a Communist Party must not isolate itself from the masses — a plea familiar to the students of the Russian, British and American movements as being repeatedly used, by the Menshevik and the compromiser. This compromise tendency expresses itself in another form by the Communist Party (Central Committee) participation in the Betriebs-rate (shop committees) — formed by the government and under direct government control, after dissolving the militant Betriebs-rate formed during the Revolution; and participation in these government organization is justified on the plea that "we must not isolate ourselves from the masses." The Central Committee, moreover, argues that Ger-

By Louis C. Fraint.

(Continued from last issue).

many being in a state of revolution, it is futile to develop a program of initiating new forms of industrial organizations which would necessarily require a span of years for its fulfillment, thereby hampering instead of promoting the immediate revolutionary struggle for power. — But Communist policy on industrial unionism, as on other problems, considers the moment in the struggle, and adapts itself to the requirements of the moment; emphasis varies as conditions vary. The agitation for industrial unionism justifies itself even should actual organization never materialize, in the sense that it is imperative to break the faith of the proletariat in the trades unions and in the machinery of the trades unions as means for revolutionary action. In the United States, which is not in a state of revolution, more emphasis is necessary on the organization aspects of industrial unionism than in Germany. The defect in the policy of the Communist Party (Central Committee) is that it has no policy on unionism; and that it is, in tendency at least, compromising, is proven by participation in the government Betriebs-rate. The struggle against the trades unions and for industrial unionism (even should new organizations never materialize) is a necessary factor in developing revolutionary consciousness and struggle.

2. — Another fundamental problem concerns the functions of a revolutionary political party — of the Communist Party. Two tendencies are apparent: a) that represented by the British Socialist Party (inherited in spirit from the moderate Socialism of the Second International) which maintains that the political party must not "dictate" to the economic movement, the unions to initiate mass action and general political strikes, the Communist Party performing simply the function of agitation; b) that represented (but as yet only in tendency) by the Opposition in the Communist Party of Germany, which maintains that the unions (revolutionary) and the political party are equal to each other, ever-emphasizing the industrial organizations — a conception which in tendency, particularly when accompanied by rejection of the revolutionary use of parliamentarism, proceeds directly to elimination of the political party. Now it is a fundamental Bolshevik (and Communist) conception that the political party is the spearhead of the revolutionary movement, dominant and decisive in the revolutionary struggle for power. The function of the Communist Party is action, not simply agitation; it must necessarily assume the initiative in developing general political strikes, in mobilizing and directing the mass action of the proletariat for the conquest of political power. The thesis on Social-Patriots and Unity adopted at the Conference proposes four fund-

amentals on the basis of which Communist groups still in the old opportunist organizations should unite, and the first is; "Mass action as the fundamental means for the conquest of power — the Communist Party as the unifying and directing factor in this mass action."

3. — The Conference decisively rejected the concept of "unity of the party" — that concept which degrades revolutionary initiative and audacity, and which, at this moment, prevents a Communist Party being organized in France and Spain, and keeps the Left Wing Independents of Germany still in the party of the betrayers of the Revolution. In Spain and in France the Left Wing is out to "capture" the Socialist Party by the process of inner transformation. The Communist struggle in an old party stultifies itself if it allows "the unity of the party" to penetrate its consciousness; nor must it become a movement to "capture" the party, thereby weakening the struggle to capture the revolutionary masses in the party. The machinery of the old party can never become an adequate movement to "capture" the party, aspirations and practice; the simple fact of a split, of a decisive break from the old and the creation of a new party in itself contributes enormously to the development of revolutionary ideology and practice. The ideology of "capture" of the party is usually identified with that of "unity of the party" — and each is Menshevik in tendency. To persist in the struggle to "capture" the party and avoid a split means to make an end the means, to compromise our revolutionary purposes; the "capture" of a party, with the retention of the Centre (and perhaps of the Right) is antagonistic to uncompromising revolutionary practice. Our most dangerous enemy is the Centre; the "capture" of a party (or its ideology) means to agree and unite with the Centre, while to split the party means immediate and rigorous separation from the Centre. The Conference emphasizes the necessity of rigorous separation of the Communists from the social-patriots and opportunists, — urging Communist groups still in the old party organizations to split and unite in the Communist Party. — The concept of "unity of the party", which some Communists still cherish, is as much a phase of the petty bourgeois ideology of moderate Socialism as are reformism and parliamentarism. This "unity of the party" concept dominates the Socialist Party of Italy, preventing the expulsion of the social-patriots and opportunists, and prevents even disciplining the parliamentarians who openly flout the party's revolutionary aspiration and practice. This situation in Italy has its immediate and peculiar reasons, perhaps; but still it is a serious defect produced largely by the concept of "unity of the party."

4. — One of most important and immediate problems is the basis of

admission to the International. The problem may be put this way; Communist parties or groups in almost every country have affiliated with the Communist International; but, the old International now being broken in pieces, there are Socialist parties in some of these countries seeking admission to the Communist International — the Left Wing Independents of Germany, the American Socialist Party, the Left Wing of the Independent Labor Party of England, the Socialist Party of Spain; and others who may seek admission, such as the French Socialist Party (Longuet Majoritaires), etc. What shall be done with these? The spirit of the discussion and thesis of the Conference mean to doublebolt the door of the Communist International to these undesirable Centre and wavering elements. This answer to the problem is emphasized by two declarations issued recently by the Executive Committee of the International in Moscow, one to the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, the other to the Socialist Party of France, in which these organizations are condemned in severe style, and informed that they are mistaken if they imagine they can enter the Communist International without purging themselves of the social-patriots and the social-traitors.

— Imagine the Socialist Party of France being admitted to the Communist International without having first disposed of the centre and the Right, of Jean Longuet as well as Marcel Cachin! — Sympathy for the Russian Revolution or deciding to join the Communist International are not enough; there must be acceptance of revolutionary principles and practice. Imagine the American Socialist Party being admitted to the Communist International while it repudiates Communist fundamentals — mass action, Soviets and proletarian dictatorship; and while it is still dominated by Morris Hillquit, Victor Berger, Meyer London, Seymour Stedman, by all its infinite variety of opportunists and social-patriots! — On this problem the Communist International will act uncompromisingly, ruthlessly; it will meet the problem by rigorous exclusion.

The Conference met at a moment of intense agitation in the International, serious problems of immediate policy and practice pressing for consideration and answer. The conference met these problems in a style that places the Conference definitely in the Left Wing of the International — a circumstance of supreme importance in the development of our movement.

What kind of Party?

(Continued from page 3.)

The single concrete proposal which the "minority" has made in regard to the Federations is the change in the method of dues payment, and this it believes is a logical and necessary change. It does not believe that a change in the method of dues payment will destroy the Federations as propaganda organizations for their particular nationality. What form the party organization shall take in the future it was and is willing to leave to the party convention, and since this convention will be made up almost exclusively of Federation representatives, it is certain the form of organization adopted will be the one that the Federations themselves desire.

AS TO LEGALITY.

One of the most amusing things in the manifesto of the "majority" group is the appeal to legalism made by this group.

"This body (the majority of the C. E. C.) together with alternates elected at the last convention, who fill vacancies created by the withdrawal of those who bolted, is the only legal Central Executive Committee".

The majority of the C. E. C. has forfeited its right to recognition by the misuse of its power which has resulted in disruption and disunity, and no appeals to "legalism" will yield back its power in the organization.

SPLITTING THE PARTY

The present division of the membership into factions is something which the "majority" group and not

groups come to one convention, in order that the membership may, through their delegates, themselves act upon the existing controversy. We therefore again propose to you joint action in calling one convention of the party and are prepared to take up discussion of details regarding this convention.

Fraternally yours,

DAVID DAMON,

Executive Secretary.

To this proposal the "majority" made no reply. The "minority" is therefore proceeding with the organization of a party convention in which the bulk of the membership will be represented and through which the party will be reorganized for active propaganda of the principles of Communism.

"A PARTY OF ACTION"

The "majority" group believes that all that is necessary for the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party to do is to seal itself in some dark room, wait for the revolution, and then come out and assume the leadership of the masses in the struggle for power. It scorns "contact with the masses".

The "minority" group believes that the party must participate actively in every struggle of the workers, endeavoring to give such struggles Communist meaning and understanding. Geo. Lansbury, editor of the London Daily Herald, who recently returned from Russia, quotes Lenin as giving similar advice to the English Communists.

The party must and will remain a party of clear understanding of principles. But such a party is valueless unless it applies those principles to the life struggles of the workers and develops the progressive stages of mass action that culminate in the social revolution itself.

Contrary to the "majority" theorizing, the "minority" does not believe that Communism can only be propagandized when the revolutionary consciousness of the masses has arrived. We believe that Communism has important applications to every stage, no matter how primitive, of the workers' struggle against capitalism. We believe that we must not wait for revolutionary consciousness, but must develop and inspire this consciousness by education and agitation.

Already the membership of the party grasps the real significance of the present party struggle and is repudiating the barren, sterile policy of the Central Executive Committee "majority" and supporting the convention called by the Executive Secretary according to the completed plans of the full C. E. C.

This convention will mean the definite reorganization of the party. It will give the membership the opportunity to express their views of the existing controversy. Out of the convention will come a stronger party, with clearer principles and a more definite program of action.

the "minority" is responsible for. — When it appeared in the negotiations between the two groups that no agreement during the interim before the convention could be reached, the "minority" made the following written proposal:

"That we discard any further discussion of the questions under controversy and proceed with the work of organizing a convention in which both groups will be represented by such delegates as they may be able to elect through the district conventions".

The "majority" group refused to consider this suggestion to preserve the party. Since that time the following letter has been addressed to the same group:

New York, April 22, 1920

To The Majority Group of the C. E. C. Communist Party
Comrades:—

At the conference between your group and ours we submitted as a final proposition to avoid in the unity of the party the following proposal:

"That we discard further discussion of the questions under controversy and proceed with the work of organizing a convention in which both groups will be represented by such delegates as they may be able to elect through the district conventions".

Our group has already issued a call for a party convention and the date has been fixed, but we are still prepared to come to an agreement on the matter of having both